

10/035,218

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-21 stand rejected in the May 22, 2003, Office action. Claim 22 is new.

35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 6 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112. Claims 6 and 16 have been amended. As to the Office action's assertion that it is "unclear whether adhesiveness [is] between the coating and the medical implant or the adhesiveness of the coating . . . to something else," the undersigned submits that the claims now more clearly identify the claimed subject matter.

Furthermore, with regard to claim 6, which now addresses the softness of the coating, the undersigned submits that originally filed claim 16 and paragraph 15 of the specification provide sufficient enablement to one of skill in the art for the claim. The specification specifically states that if the coating is unable to resist damage during expansion, the number of folds can be increased. Thus, the specification teaches that softer coatings (i.e., coatings that are unable to resist damage) can require more folds as increasing the number of folds can reduce the magnitude of the force that each fold places on the coating. See paragraph 15 of the specification. Accordingly, the specification shows that by increasing the number of folds the forces placed on the coating can be reduced and softer or less resilient coatings can, thereby, be accommodated.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 and 12-15 stand rejected under various combinations of Wright et al. (6,273,913), Fischell et al. (5,792,172), Hillstead (5,116,318), Buteneuer et al. (5,147,302), Trotta et al. (5,290,306) and Jung et al. (5,352,236). As none of these references disclose or suggest a balloon catheter with a previously selected number of folds "being selected to reduce the deformation of coating of the medical implant caused by the expansion of the multi-wing balloon during expansion of the coated medical implant," as substantially recited in claims 1 and

10/035,218

15, the undersigned submits that all of the pending claims are patentable over the cited references. For instance, Wright, the primary reference, fails to disclose an internally coated medical device at all, let alone a method or system as recited in the claims. Consequently, claims 1 and 15, and all of their dependent claims, are patentable over the cited references.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the undersigned respectfully submits that the application is patentable over the cited references. Should the Examiner have any questions concerning this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number given below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any necessary fees, or to credit any overpayments, to deposit account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 21, 2003


Fred T. Grasso, Esq.
Reg. No. 43,644

KENYON & KENYON
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005-1257
Tel.: (202) 220-4200
Fax.: (202) 220-4201

465242v1